CIVIL RIGHTS—RESOLUTION OF HOLLY HILL, S.C., METHODIST CHURCH

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution which has been approved by the Holly Hill Methodist Church of Holly Hill, S.C., on April 17, 1964. This resolution takes a strong stand against the so-called civil rights legislation and also disassociates this church from the stated positions of the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches in support of this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLY HILL METHODIST CHURCH,
Holly Hill, S.C., April 17, 1964.

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the official board of the Holly Hill Methodist Church, Holly Hill, S.C., that efforts are being made on behalf of passage of the civil rights bill, now pending before Congress, by the World Council of Churches, and the National Council of Churches; and

Whereas these two church bodies are representing their position as that of the various denominations and church groups contributing to the support of these two organizations; and

Whereas such positions are being brought to the attention of the Members of Congress of the United States, and are being represented to said Members of Congress as the views of the supporting denominations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the official board of the Holly Hill Methodist Chuch, Holy Hill, S.C., go on record as opposing such views, positions, and representations of the World and National Council of Churches, and make it known that these organizations are not speaking for or presenting the views of the Holly Hill Methodist Church; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of both Houses of Congress, and to all Senators and Congressmen of the State of South Carolina in order to protest the action of these two organizations.

M. C. COLVIN,
Chairman of the Official Board.

Signed April 17, 1964.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Dr. Mary I. Bunting, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 2768. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2769. A bill for the relief of Luis Mario Tredici, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE RESOLUTION 308

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate Resolution 308, relating to gathering of and publication of speeches of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the names of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. TALMADGE:

The 1963 American Success Story Award to Roy Richards of Carrollton, Ga.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Column entitled "Lessons of Ex-Ambassador Murphy", written by Richard Wilson, published in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on April 22, 1964.

Editorial entitled "Civil Right Bill Is Not Morally Right", published in the Newberry (S.C.) Observer.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a column on Vietnam by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post of April 21, 1964. Mr. Lippmann is an outstanding journalist, and whether one agrees with him or not, his prose is invariably stimulating and thought provoking. The article previously referred to seems to me to be exceptional. In it Mr. Lippmann analyzes the situation in Vietnam with unusual accuracy and clarity. He debunks the idea that a painless way to victory is to encourage General Khanh to carry the war into North Vietnam. He explains why such advocacy is glib and irresponsible both in terms of its immediate military objective of defeating North Vietnam and in terms of the ultimate objective of ending the strife in the south.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY DEBATE

(By Walter Lippmann)

After spending a few days in Saigon, Mr. Nixon has come home with a formula for winning the war in southeast Asia. The reason we are not winning it now is, he says, that we believe in "Yalu River concepts of private sanctuaries," and for that reason we are preventing the South Vietnamese, who presumably are raring to go, from taking the offensive, from carrying the war into Laos and to the north, and of winning the war there.

Mr. Nixon ought to know better, and perhaps he does know better, than to say that the reason why South Vietnam does not win the war in North Vietnam is that the United States won't let it. The indubitable fact is that South Vietnam is quite incapable of carrying the war successfully into North Vietnam. That is not because we will not give it arms. We do give it arms. It is because the South Vietnamese have very little fighting morale and are well aware from experiments that have already been made that raiding in North Vietnam means almost certain death. Let us hope that Mr. Nixon is not going to revive, at this late date, the old chestnut which we used to hear about "unleasing Chiang Kai-shek," and ask us to believe that victory can be had by unleasing General Khanh.

General Khanh is leashed by the unwillingness of the large majority of the South Vietnamese to fight on in the civil war. "Hot pursuit" indeed: where are the Vietnamese soldiers who are hot about pursuing the Vietcong into the clutches of General Giap? The truth, which is being obscured for the American people, is that the Saigon Government has the allegiance of probably no more than 30 percent of the people and controls (even in daylight) not much more than a quarter of the territory.

The real and immediate problem in South Vietnam is to prevent a collapse of a weak government which is losing the civil war. That is the paramount objective of the Johnson-McNamara policy—to prevent a bad situation from becoming impossible. It is certainly not a glorious policy, or even a promising one, and it has led high officials of the administration into making commitments that had better been left unmade. But the policy is at least concerned with the reality of the situation, which is the need to prevent a collapse and surrender before there is an opportunity to work out a political solution in the area.

Any other plan for "winning the war" in southeast Asia must be, if the speaker is being candid and not tricky, a plan for the intervention of the United States with large forces prepared to overwhelm the whole of Indochina and to confront mainland China itself. All schemes for interdicting outside help to the Vietcong can be carried out only by the U.S. Air Force. The South Vietnamese Government does not have the bombers and could not fly them if they had them in any such enterprise. The enterprise should never be undertaken unless we are prepared to have a large war with China.

In his review of foreign policy on Monday, the President was in effect saying that there has been no material change since the death of President Kennedy. Our relations with Russia, which took a decided turn for the better between the Cuban crisis and the test ban treaty, have continued to improve, slowly to be sure, but to improve.

On the other hand, in the areas where President Kennedy had not been succeeding, things are about as they were. This is true of Europe, of Asia, and of South America. There is a pause in Europe and perhaps also in Latin America. This may be in part because new developments have not gone far enough to show what is going to happen, in part because of the coming elections—here and in Britain and in Chile this year, in Germany and France and Brazil next year. There is a pause in the Far East because the war plans of Messrs. Nixon and Goldwater are unworkable and undesirable, and any other kind of plan is, as Senator FULBRIGHT would say, still unthinkable.

This pause permits President Johnson to devote himself primarily to our too long postponed and too much neglected internal problems.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD AT MONTANA CENTENNIAL DINNER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech I delivered at the Montana centennial dinner, at the Sheraton Park Hotel, on April 17, 1964.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MONTANA CENTENNIAL DINNER

(Address by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 17, 1964)

My fellow Montanan, this is the week that was. This was the week that the Butte, Anaconda & Pacific Railroad settled its strike, resumed it and settled it once again. I am happy to state that notice received from Butte and Anaconda this morning that the men are back at work and the smelters and mines are working at capacity and the possible shutdown at Great Falls has been averted.

This is the week that our Chief Executive, Governor Babcock, came into Washington to arrange, I thought, for the Montana centennial celebration. I find, however, after duly investigating that he had a dual purpose. He was also trying to arrange for the selection of a Republican candidate for President by attending the Republican Governors conference. I understand that he has been a lot more successful with the arrangements for the centennial celebration and I am delighted that he is with us tonight.

This is the week that the C.H.—Chet Huntley—brand was put on certain nature-fed cattle in New Jersey and now I understand it has been taken off. His feeding lot operation, however, continues and still furnishes a dire threat to the well-being of Montana cattlemen. His beef is of a very superior quality. But it was not his special nature-feed that made the difference. The truth is that it was simply the bulls which he has been importing from Cardwell and Reed Point.

This is the week that a new silver dollar was being produced in the new mint in Bozeman. It is known as the Montana double-cartwheel and is made by pasting two 50-cent pieces back to back. My latest information is that there is now not only a shortage of silver dollars in our State but we also face a shortage of half dollars.

This is the week that coin collectors are after me because they do not want new dollars minted with the 1922 date on it. I want them to know that I am with them all the way. I have a few myself. Some dealers also want free and ready access to the 3 million rare silver dollars now being held in the vaults in the Treasury. The cellars of the Treasury Department have become the greatest mining find since the Virginia City-Bannock gold strikes of a century ago.

This is the week in which it was announced that beef imports were reduced by 220 million pounds this year through voluntary agreements with Australia and New Zealand. This is the week in which it was announced that 68 million pounds of domestic beef is being purchased by the Defense Department for the use of Armed Forces overseas. And this is the week that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman announced that $20 million would be spent for the purchase of domestic beef to supplement school lunch programs and the like.

This is the week that Marvin Brooks and Cloyd Wampler consented to come out of their hibernation in Pony and Wisdom and travel to the Nation's Capitol to show what magnificent citizenship is produced in two of the smallest towns of one of the biggest States of the Union.

This is the week in which I have been confronted with one of the few genuine drafts of my life aside from being named majority leader of the Senate. I was drafted to make this speech tonight. And then, of course, to make sure that I would be here for this most pleasant assignment, "Monty" Montana lassoed me on the steps of the Capitol and, very fortunately, in public. It was only coincidental, with November not so far away, that CBS, ABC, NBC, and Frank Muto were close by.

This is the week we advertised Brinkley and came up with Huntley. And this is the week that one Senator says that all Senators ought to publish a list of outside business interests and inside assets and another Senator says that if they did so, they would become second-class citizens.

This is the week when the Democrats finally recaptured the State House; our Senator David Manning from Treasure County who happens to be a Democrat is serving as Acting Governor. On that score, of course, I can assure the Governor, that the State is in good hands, that Montana will still be there when you get back.

And now to turn from the week that was to the moment that is, I want to say that railroad trains fascinate all youngsters. The Centennial Train, I am sure, will make children out of people of all ages.

This extraordinary pilgrimage is a kind of Lewis and Clark expedition in reverse. Montanans, in effect, are bringing civilization back to the East. May I suggest that you lock up your silver dollars while you are in this part of the country. A veritable passion for cartwheels has developed here in the East, and we would like very much to avoid a too realistic reenactment of one of the great train robberies of the past.

In any case, I do know that this train with its wonderful cargo of Montanans and its treasures is fully in keeping with the traditions of the Big Sky Country. I am delighted to see it and you here in Washington.

The train tells a great deal of us and of our part in the building of a nation. It unfolds a dramatic history on a continental scale. The characters in this drama provide the cast of a thousand movies. The settings are familiar to hundreds of millions of TV viewers not only in our own country but throughout the world. It is all here either in replica or by suggestion: The towering mountains, the plains, the desert; the wigwam, the covered wagon, the lonely trading post or the settler's cabin, the gold camps and ghost towns, the territorial legislature and the offices of the giant corporations Even the saloons are here, although the liquor, no doubt, is not as hard as it used to be—well, not quite as hard. And here, too, are the Indians, cowpokes, trappers, lumbermen, ranchers, miners, copper kings, politicians, statesmen, outlaws, and vigilantes.

All of these are parts of the saga of our State. After Lewis and Clark brought back the first reports, many made the trek westward to become a part of the drama. They came from all of these Eastern States and the Mississippi Valley. They came from Europe and from Asia. They came to trap, to log, to mine, to railroad, to trade, to preach, to teach, to farm and to work at whatever needed doing. And some came to rob and to kill and others to stop the robbings and killings.

All left their mark. Some moved farther west and others went back East. But many stayed and worked and built.

They confronted a land and an Indian way of life unchanged for millenia and they changed both. And Montana, in turn, changed the pioneers and their descendants. Out of the infusion of ideas and energy, in an incredibly short time—remember that the Lewis and Clark expedition was scarcely a century and a half ago and Custer's last stand less than a century ago—out of this infusion emerged the Treasure State as we know it today.

It is a State big enough to remember the past without bitterness. It is a State warm enough to accommodate, with a mutual tolerance, all the human strains of its present diversity. It is a State which, today, is great enough for its people to live together in peace and to share fully in all the hopes for a peaceful nation in a peaceful world.

But it was not always so. Change is rarely easy. More often than not, change is conflict, the conflict of man against man, man against nature and man against himself. Change is hope and the dashing of hope but always the rebirth of hope.

From the very beginning that has been the pattern of Montana life. We have had our times of disappointment and disaster. Repeated Indian wars, in our State, as elsewhere, for example, left scars which were a long time in healing on both sides. Trappers and prospectors died lonely and senseless deaths in the early search for wealth in furs and gold and silver. Miners, sheep and cattlemen, wheat ranchers, railroaders and businessmen and their families ate the bread of bitterness in the great depression and problems of unemployment, even if less extreme, still affect us today. Natural calamities of weather and range and the unnatural calamaties of the market have from time to time plagued our ranchers and farmers.

Yet in spite of these recurrent difficulties, perhaps, in part because of them, Montana is the vigorous State that it is. We have learned many things from our turbulent history. And most important I think, we have learned how to roll with the process of change itself while holding on to what is enduring in our heritage and tradition.

This ability to recognize and to seize the opportunities presented by changing circumstances, to be guided by but not bound by the past, is a quality which in these times has great significance for the Nation as a whole in its relations with the rest of the world.

For today, the United States functions in a world of change. Western Europe is changing rapidly and parts of the Communist world, apparently, are shaking loose from the hogties of rigid dogma. That world, too, is undergoing change from Berlin to the Urals and beyond. Recent statements of Mr. Khrushchev suggest to his credit that he is convinced that there is dignity in responding to man's needs in peace and that it is to be preferred to mass death in ideological war. This awareness has not yet, apparently, penetrated the consciousness of the Chinese leaders. But the Chinese people, I am confident, understand that there is much to be said for a full life over nuclear death. The day may not be too distant when Chinese leadership will also have to accept what the Chinese people understand.

Among the Western nations there is also charge from a heavy dependency on the United States to a greater independence. It is true that this independence sometimes seems to border on the fragmentation of Western unity. Yet it is a much healthier state of affairs than an apparent unity which would be held together only by an old cement patched up with a lavish use of American resources. In Africa, there is the transition to national independence on a continental scale. It is not an easy transition but it has begun and it will not be reversed.

And in the deadly nuclear confrontation between Russia and the United States there is the reality and the hope of the nuclear test ban treaty. No single achievement, may I say, meant more to our late President than this treaty and one of the most satisfying experiences of my years in public life was to help in securing its ratification by the Senate. The agreement stopped what had threatened to become a callous disregard for the health of all people and their descendants

in the name of science and security. And the potential of that first step in terms of further progress toward stability remains a principal resource for peace.

In this era of worldwide change there are both new dangers and new opportunities for the United States. We shall reduce the dangers and enhance the opportunities as we perceive the realities of the change. It is a wonderful thing to re-create the world of a century ago on a train bound for the New York World's Fair. But it would be unfortunate if we mistook the re-creation for the current reality, if we let ourselves believe that this is really how we live today. It is just as unfortunate, in the affairs of the Nation, to cling to the belief that the world of today remains the same as the world of 15 or 20 years ago. It would be tragic, too, to assume that the policies of 1945, 1950, and even 1955 or 1960 suffice for the present era of international relations.

We have no difficulty in distinguishing between territorial Montana a century ago and Montana today. But sometimes there is difficulty in distinguishing between the world of 20 or 10 years ago and what was adequate for our needs then and the world today and what is necessary if we are to live in it. It seems to me that the late President with his deep and sensitive human perception was fully aware of the worldwide changes which were taking place. He sought to bring the rest of the Nation to a similar state of awareness. And in his first statement to the Congress, President Johnson called upon us "to continue" what President Kennedy had begun.

That, it seems to me, is the great task ahead. We must continue to examine and to re-examine and examine again every premise of policy on which we have operated for so many years. Some of these premises, I am sure, will remain as sound as they were on the day that they were conceived. Others will be found to have lost some of their significance or to have been bypassed by subsequent developments.

We will have to think hard, for example, about the possibility of increased commerce in peaceful goods, along the lines of the great wheat trades of this year. The legislation which made possible these trades was the last matter of policy on which President Kennedy communicated with me before his death. The trades, in effect, were made possible by the Congress after his death at the continued urging of President Johnson.

These trades have cut into our surpluses. They have brought a tangible return to us. And they have helped to take our great bounty of food out of the realm of international animosities and put it where it should be—in the realm of international peace. Additional mutually advantageous trade along these lines may well serve as a modest instrument for advancing friendship among all peoples.

We will have to recognize now and in the years ahead that peace does not require all nations to goosestep to identical policies in order to live together in and to work together for peace. The nationalism and self-interest of many countries, no less than our own, sometimes requires them to take positions in world affairs which do not necessarily coincide with ours. And, in this connection, it is important to recognize that the effort to maintain or to achieve a position of independent neutrality by certain countries is not necessarily inconsistent with the long-range interests of the United States. After all, we have lived very well for decades with a neutral Sweden and a neutral Switzerland and, more recently, with a neutral Austria and an essentially neutral Finland. These nations are free and friendly even though their policies are not always alined with ours. Our relations with them are excellent and mutually advantageous even though they are not allied, let alone subservient to our policies.

We will have to continue to revise our concepts of foreign aid. We have seen this program backfire in many places, notwithstanding its achievements in others. It may be that we will come to understand that aid, however unavoidable it may be in our current policies, is still limited in its potential. It is not a cure-all for the ills and inequities of the contemporary world. We may come to understand that the principal factor in the progress, peace, and freedom of other nations is neither what we or the Russians do but what these nations do for themselves. It is not necessary to retreat into isolation in order to recognize that there are rational limits at any given time to the efficacy of international involvement. In the same pattern, it is also becoming clearer that international responsibility does not require us to be in the vanguard of every issue and crisis which may arise. On the contrary, it is most desirable to share the burdens of international peace and progress through the United Nations and in other ways with as many nations as possible.

Finally, I think there is hope for a continued slowdown in arms competition, largely as a result of the nuclear test ban treaty. The defense budget may not require, in the future, quite the enormous percentage—it is now upwards of 50 percent—of our Federal expenditures. If this hope is realized, we may be able to act with greater determination and without a crippling burden of taxation, on the many problems which confront us at home. What is involved here is not only a war on poverty, as it has been called. There are immense and growing needs which are not being satisfactorily met in education, in recreation, in health, in the prevention of crime, in the whole range of public services. In short, as peace is reinforced, we should be in a better position to engage ourselves with vigor in a general effort to improve the opportunity for a full and satisfying life for all the people of the Nation.

The affairs of people halfway around the world may seem remote and unimportant to those who are lucky enough to live in the quiet and peace of our State. They may not appear to have much relevance on a happy train ride to New York. But they are of the utmost relevance. The international situation affects our opportunity to work, to plan and, in the end, even to live our lives in decency and in peace. We know, some of us with great personal sorrow, that events whose origins lay thousands of miles from our shores have reached repeatedly into Montana and called us forth to great international conflicts. As Montanans, as Americans, we have a duty and a responsibility to make sure that no opportunity is left unexamined in the search for a just and lasting peace.

JOSEPH J. McQUEENEY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week one of the finest and best liked men in New Haven, Joseph J. McQueeney, passed away. All who knew him will always remember his generous spirit, his quiet dedication to the welfare of others, his unflagging amiability, and his devotion to the responsibilities he unselfishly undertook throughout the course of his life.

He contributed richly to an era in the life of New Haven which is gone but which lives on in the happy memories of those who experienced it.

His brother, Charles McQuenney, the able and respected managing editor of the New Haven Register, has written a memorable column about his older brother which will deeply move not only those who knew Joe McQueeney personally, but all who have an insight into human nature and an appreciation of what is truly important in life.

I wish to pay my respect to the memory of Joseph McQueeney and to express my sorrow and sympathy to his widow and to his family for the very great loss which they have sustained.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this column, which appeared in the New Haven Register-Journal Courier on Saturday, April 18, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sadness cloaked its veil over our family during the past week. Death struck unexpectedly and took the oldest member of the brood, our big brother. He was just that for a long while, from our childhood days as a matter of fact. And from the time he was a young man, he was not only big brother to us, but also played the role of father—and played it well—following the death of our pop. We owe much to him, especially for his wise counsel down through the years. Often it was, in our youth, that we sought his advice and never once do we recall that he failed us. Many times after listening to him we decided to do it our own way, only to find that we would have been better off it we had done as he suggested. As a growing lad, whenever we were short of funds, Joe was always an easy touch. On occasion we forgot to make repayment, but he never complained. We feel certain that when he gave us a loan, he sort of kissed it goodby. We also can recall the many times when we were the dude of State Street, all dressed up in his best. He was always a pretty dapper fellow and when we were his size, we must admit we looked pretty good in a suit or topcoat belonging to him. He'd blow his stack as he watched us emerge in his best, admonishing us to "take it off" but he'd soon relent with a warning "it's all right tonight, but remember, this is the last time I want to see you in anything of mine." We looked good in his ties too, and he could talk himself blue in the face trying to dissuade us from wearing them. It was all talk to no avail. Anytime we wanted to add a little something to our getup, his tie rack was one of our favorite targets. Other male members of the family also took advantage of him in this respect. It was, in a way, a tribute to his fine taste.

In his youth he was very active in the activities at Yale Hall down Franklin Street way. There, he and other neighborhood kids worked with Richard (Pop) Lovell, later going over to Jefferson Street when the new Boys' Club was erected. He was one of the real sparkplugs in the new but growing Boys' Club. It wasn't too long after its start in the new location that Mr. Lovell had fine teams afield, especially in football. Our big brother, along with Bill Cronin, comanaged the teams for several years keeping a sharp eye on the financial aspects. Our eyes used to pop when he'd come home from a Sunday afternoon game, carrying a bag full of money, money received as a guarantee from the rival team or taken up in a collection among the fans. He and Cronin would sit at our family table counting the money and making out reports to be handed to Mr. Lovell. They'd turn over sizable sums every week, for the Boys' Club teams in that era were always a top attraction. We remember too that as a Boys' Clubber, he tried his hand at acting. He had an important role in something called Officer 666. We vividly remember mom

taking us down to the Jefferson Street gym to watch our hero and we were real proud of his performance. As we reflect on it now, there was plenty of ham on the stage that night but we weren't aware of it. We thought he turned in a magnificent performance. Broadway was flourishing at the time and Hollywood was in its infancy, but neither put in a hurried call for him or any other member of the cast.

Some years ago we saw our first Shubert show as his guest. He asked us to "Sinbad," starring Al Jolson. He took us to the old Hyperion on occasion, or the old Poli Palace for a special TMA benefit. A fight fan in his early days, he also paid our way so that we could be with him at some of the bouts at the Arena or the old Nutmeg Stadium on River Street. We can't explain it, but we have long had the feeling that we were something special to him. He was always very proud of any accomplishment of ours and never hesitated to tell us when he thought our Saturday Journal was good or that someone had spoken to him about it. He was proudest whenever anyone mentioned his kid brother on the Register. He picked us to be best man at his wedding and he acted in the same capacity at ours. He was loyal to his family and his job and most devout in his practice of his religion. We feel strongly that if ever a guy had made it up there, he's the one. We can envision him in reunion with mom and pop, bringing them up to date on all that transpired since they went. We hope he has told them how much we miss them. We know we're going to miss him just as much.

DEMONSTRATIONS AT OPENING OF NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to go record in protest of the intemperate and disrespectful treatment afforded President Johnson Wednesday last, at the opening of the New York World's Fair, by a handful of mischievous demonstrators. These people, in my opinion, seem to have "redoubled their efforts when they have forgotten their aim."

Let us hope that the failure of the so-called stall-in was due to the realization by many of those involved that such plans were indeed rooted in folly. Had such a massive demonstration materialized, it might have generated, as the New York Times observed, "animosities and bitterness that could have done untold harm."

There is a well-known phrase from the fertile mind of Benjamin Franklin that seems to the point in this matter.

A little neglect,

He wrote—

may breed mischief; for want of a nail the shoe was lost; for want of a shoe the horse was lost; for want of a horse the rider was lost.

It may be added, however, that too many nails driven into the hoof will equally bring the horse up lame. The contest is lost either way.

The protests in our country during recent years by our shamefully oppressed minority groups were motivated by acute suffering, bitter neglect and real grievances. These problems have been brought into the glaring light of national debate, and the concern of our Congress and our administration is now sincerely involved in attempting to rectify these wretched discrepancies.

But, Mr. President, I must deplore the current rash of militant action by a small group of misguided citizens. Some of these people seem to have developed a ravenous appetite for anarchy, a total defiance of law and order which has not and will not be tolerated in America.

It is especially unfortunate that this militancy is being accelerated around the Nation when this body of laws has before it a civil rights bill that is being fought for by men of good will and sober principle. This bill was passed by the House overwhelmingly and I am certain that, when given the opportunity, the U.S. Senate will also pass the bill. President Johnson has given it his unqualified support, and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is now attempting to lead the bill to its inevitable passage.

I support this bill, Mr. President, but I wanted at this time to caution the extremists. This is a time of coming together, of working together toward the same goal. Let us argue and debate, but let us remember that we must do so with reasonable attitudes and moderate actions, for the good of all our citizens.

The Baltimore Evening Sun of last night contains an editorial entitled "Opening Day," and the Washington Post of this morning carries a similar editorial, entitled "The Stall-in Failure." I ask unanimous consent that both editorials be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, Apr. 23, 1964]

OPENING DAY

For whatever reason, the threatened massive snarl of traffic at the opening of the World's Fair failed to develop. The reaction must be one of relief, particularly for supporters of the Federal civil rights bill. On the other hand, opponents of the Negro demands for equal treatment can take no satisfaction from yesterday's events. For one thing, the type of tactics adopted by the militant splinter civil rights forces in New York would have played into the segregationists' hands if successful. For another, the principal civil rights groups still mounted sit-in and other more orthodox demonstrations to show their dissatisfaction with the slow pace of desegregation.

Although the stall-in on major roads leading to the fairgrounds did not materialize, isolated attempts were made to hinder subway traffic. In at least one of the encounters several demonstrators emerged with bleeding heads. Fingers holding subway doors open were rapped with night sticks. Demonstrators blocking entrances to several exhibits at the fair were dragged by their heels—down a flight of stairs in several instances—by private guards. There is insufficient evidence, at least for the moment, to sustain any charge of police brutality. A lesson may nonetheless be drawn from the experience.

Yesterday may well have been opening day not only of the fair but also of spring and summer civil rights demonstrations throughout the Nation. Leaders of the major civil rights organizations probably could not stop them even if they wanted to. The scuffles in the subway, the bumping of demonstrators down steps, the atmosphere of tension created by the belligerent threats of the most militant civil rights groups are not a necessary part of the demonstration process nor of proper measures to preserve order and the public's safety. Restraint on both sides will not be easy to maintain in the crisis of conscience which faces the United States this spring of 1964. But it must be maintained, by authorities and demonstrators alike and equally, if the extremists of both races are not to guide the course of events for the coming months.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 24, 1964]

THE STALL-IN FAILURE

The country can be much relieved over the failure of the New York stall-in to disrupt seriously the opening day at the World's Fair. But even though the demonstrators did not succeed, the effects of their effort long will be weighed seriously by thoughtful people.

This whole disorder must be distinguished from the demonstrations involving protest against specific abuses. It was essentially an effort to make the community aware of the total position of the Negro people by inflicting undiscriminating injury, pain, and inconvenience upon other citizens. No one can doubt the ability of a very small minority to inconvenience very greatly the entire population of so complicated and delicate an organism as a large metropolitan center. But a minority that turns to this kind of reprisal is itself employing a kind of blind and undiscriminating racial hatred. The face of racism is no prettier when it is antiwhite than when it is antiblack. The Negro leader who mobilizes his community in such an effort is trying to arouse and not seeking to diminish racial hatred.

Such is the patience and understanding of the Negro rank and file that these methods are not likely to enlist mass support as long as the hope of the Negro for a fair deal still survives. The appropriate answer to these extremists on the part of the white community is a renewed effort to show that these hopes are going to be realized. It would be tragic indeed if these misguided disorders alienated the great support that has risen in this country for an end to discrimination.

One of the most alarming aspects of this resort to lawless methods is the reluctance of even conservative Negroes to condemn them. The fact that such extreme steps can gain support from any Negro followers only suggests the degree of racial consciousness that generations of discrimination have fostered in the Negro. For more than 100 years, we have been telling the Negro that he is different from the rest of us, that he must live, eat, drink, and go to school separately. We have beseeched him to accept the notion that he is different. We have belabored him into an awareness of his racial identity. There now is a danger that he may have been made so race conscious as to follow unthinkingly even the most misguided Negro leaders as long as they speak in the name of and act for the Negro race.

That danger must be faced. It is a danger that discrimination and despair could multiply. It is a danger that can be diminished only by divesting our laws, our economic practices and our social institutions of racial consciousness. We must move more swiftly toward an end to discrimination, not because of the New York stall-ins, but in spite of them.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TALMADGE AT SENATE BREAKFAST

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] delivered an excellent address before the Senate breakfast on April 22, regarding training our youth in principles and patriotism.

As always, the address of the Senator from Georgia was forceful and worthy. I believe it should be preserved and given wide circulation.